REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 13-15 and 18 are currently pending in the present application. In the present Amendment, Applicant has proposed an amendment to Claim 9 to correct its dependency. Because the proposed amendment does not raise any new issues that require further search, Applicant believes that the proposed amendment is proper after final rejection and respectfully requests its entry.

In paragraph 3 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-2, 6-7, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,473,101 B1 to *Grigor et al.* (*Grigor*). In addition, in paragraph 4, Claims 3, 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Grigor* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,236 B1 to *Ku et al.* (*Ku*). Those rejections are respectfully traversed, and favorable reconsideration of the claims is requested.

Applicant believes that *Grigor,* whether considered alone or in combination with *Ku*, does not render the present invention unpatentable because the prior art of record does not teach or suggest each feature of exemplary Claim 1. For example, the set of data processing systems set forth in exemplary Claim 1 includes:

> switching means including an input controller coupled to said single set of input device and to each of said at least two data processing systems, wherein said switching means, responsive to the active data processing system signaling movement of the cursor past a logical common boundary between two logical display areas, for automatically switching transmission of signals from the single set of input devices from the active data processing system to another data processing system corresponding to a logical display area sharing the logical common boundary with the logical display area for the active data processing system, wherein the other data processing system becomes the active data processing system.

Thus, exemplary Claim 1 requires a that the claimed switching means switch input device signals between data processing systems in response to an active data processing system signaling movement of a cursor past a logical boundary between display areas. Such a switching means is not taught or suggested by *Grigor* and/or *Ku*.

With respect to the claimed "switching means" and "input controller," page 3, paragraph 2 of the present Office Action cites a combination of the control logic 62 and controller 72 shown in *Grigor's* Figure 1b. However, as is evident upon inspection of *Grigor's* Figure 1b and the accompanying description found at col. 4, lines 14-25, control logic 62 and controller 72 do not perform the switching function required of the claimed "switching means" by exemplary Claim 1. That is, *Grigor's* input device signals (or position indication data) 30 are always received and processed by control logic 62. Control logic 62 does not transmit (output) the input device signals (even to controller 72), and in particular, does not switch transmission of the input device signals between an active data processing system and another data processing system, as required by Claim 1. In short, *Grigor's* control logic 62 and controller 72 do not perform any switching functions similar to that claimed. Consequently, Applicant believes that *Grigor* cannot be said to teach or suggest the claimed switching means and that the rejections of Claim 1, similar Claims 7 and 15, and their respective dependent claims are overcome.

It should be noted that Applicant recognizes that *Grigor* clearly teaches panning a mouse cursor between multiple displays, for example, in Figure 5a. However, as the Examiner will appreciate from the foregoing, *Grigor's* technique for panning the mouse cursor between display devices does not entail any switching in the transmission of input device signals, regardless of how many processing devices are implemented by *Grigor*. It is therefore clear that *Grigor* simply teaches a different, and patentably distinct, technique for panning a mouse cursor across multiple displays.

Having now responded to each rejection set forth in the present Office Action, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such allowance.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. **50-0563**.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian F. Russell

Brian F. Russell
Registration No. 40,796
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 969
Austin, Texas 78767-0969
(512) 472-7800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT